

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/322,073	GUHEEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Robert M. Pond	3625	

All Participants:

(1) Robert M. Pond.

(2) Mr. Ken Smolik, Reg. #44,314.

Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 15 November 2005

Time: 12:15 PM Eastern

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☒ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: Proposed amendments to drawings and specification.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

None

Claims discussed:

None

Prior art documents discussed:

None


Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 Robert M. Pond
 Primary Examiner

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Issues discussed: Requirement for TD; method claim language; proposed amendment cannot be incorporated into an Examiner's amendment. Examiner is to file a non-final office action based on new grounds under non-statutory double patenting; make suggestions to method claim language to overcome prior art rejection..